

Reference:

BA/2018/0137/FUL

Location

Lynwood, Irstead Road, Neatishead

BA/2018/0137/FUL Lynwood, Irestead Road, Neatishead



Application for Determination
Report by Planning Officer (Compliance and Implementation)

Target Date	26.06.2018
Parish:	Neatishead Parish Council
Reference:	BA/2018/0137/FUL
Location:	Lynwood, Irstead Road, Neatishead, NR12 8BJ
Proposal:	Replacement dwelling
Applicant:	Mrs Christine Breden
Recommendation:	Approve subject to conditions
Reason for referral to Committee:	District Member request and objections received which raise material considerations of significant weight

1 Description of Site and Proposals

- 1.1 The application site contains a single storey residential bungalow within the rural Parish of Neatishead. The site sits on Neatishead Road, to the south of Limekiln Dyke and forms part of the Neatishead Conservation Area. A single storey bungalow is situated to the immediate west and a two storey dwelling sits to the immediate east. The plots are characterised by long linear rear gardens which stretch north to Limekiln Dyke, with the properties' main elevations facing the road to the south. Dwellings along this stretch of the road vary slightly in size but many are one and a half to two storeys high and are of a medium scale. The age of the properties also vary with older traditional dwellings being interspersed by newer properties.
- 1.2 The application is for the replacement of the single storey bungalow with a 1 and a half storey dwelling house. The existing dwelling is a 1960's construction, constructed with red brick and a concrete tiled roof. The replacement dwelling house is proposed to be constructed in red brick with clay pantiles. The joinery is proposed to be powder coated aluminium. The

existing road access is proposed to be retained. The design has been amended since the original submission following advice from our Conservation Officer and responding to a number of concerns raised by consultees and neighbours.

2 Site History

- 2.1 BA/1988/3390/HISTAP – Rear Extension to Bungalow – Approved subject to conditions

3 Consultations

- 3.1 Consultations received

Response to original plans

District Member- Irstead Road is a prominent and attractive route used by countless holidaymakers and visitors as they walk to the village shop, pub and village hall. It is important that any new build should be sensitive to the existing character and integrity of this road. From the present plan, it is my concern that the design does not reflect this.

Parish Council- The Parish Council would like to comment on the application BA/2018/0137/FUL, Lynwood, Irstead Road, Neatishead NR12 8BJ

The Parish Council are concerned by the size of the proposed extension and some concern was raised that the original footprint of the property includes paving that surrounds the property. The paving slabs should not be included in the original footprint.

This proposed extension to the front of the existing property will not be appropriate to the road in which it sits. It is not in the same style as the other properties and the houses sit back from the road, with the proposed extension this will change the visual aspect of this road.

There have been a number of concerns raised as to how the proposed extension may have impact to the neighbouring properties and feel that the concerns raised in the letter to you dated 14th May are genuine and many valid points have been raised that need to be seriously addressed. Therefore the parish council supports the comments raised in the letter and cannot approve the plans as they currently stand and would urge that as well as the issues raised in the letter be addressed but that the applicant reviews/alters their plans this.

Response to amended

District Member: To be reported orally

Parish Council: To be reported orally

3.2 Representations received

Response to original plans

2x Neighbour objection on grounds of:

- Location
- Building Line
- Scale
- Mass
- Height
- Design
- External Appearance
- Impact on Conservation Area
- Amenity – overlooking, overshadowing and visual amenity

Response to amended plans

1x Neighbour support

4 Policies

4.1 The following Policies have been assessed for consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and have been found to be consistent and can therefore be afforded full weight in the consideration and determination of this application.

NPPF

Development-Management-DPD2011

DP1- Natural Environment

DP2- Landscape and Trees

DP4- Design

DP11- Access on Land

4.2 The following Policies have been assessed for consistency with the NPPF and have found to lack full consistency with the NPPF and therefore those aspects of the NPPF may need to be given some weight in the consideration and determination of this application.

DP5- Historic Environment

DP28- Amenity

4.3 The following Policies have been assessed for consistency with the NPPF and have found to not accord with the NPPF and therefore those aspects of the NPPF may need to be given some weight in the consideration and determination of this application.

DP24- Replacement Dwellings

5 Assessment

- 5.1 In terms of the assessment of this proposal the main matters to be considered include the principle of the development, design, impact on the character of the Conservation Area, amenity, trees, access and ecology.

Principle

- 5.2 Policy DP24 allows for the replacement of existing dwellings on a one for one basis so long as the existing dwelling has a lawful residential use. This dwelling has an established residential use and as the proposal is for a single replacement it is considered acceptable in principle. Policy DP24 has other criteria covering design, replacement on the same footprint and the existing dwelling having no historic or architectural significance making it worthy of retention, which will be assessed below.

Design

- 5.3 In terms of design, Policy DP24 highlights that the replacement should be located on the same building footprint as the existing dwelling, or in an area which would make it less visually prominent. The replacement is proposed to be on the same building footprint as the existing dwelling which is considered appropriate and in character with the existing building line of the street. The existing dwelling, which is of a simple 1960's construction, is of no particular historic or architectural merit making it worthy of retention. It is therefore considered that the proposal does accord with the design criteria of policy DP24 also.

Impact on the Character of the Conservation Area

- 5.4 Turning to wider design matters, covered by Policies DP4 and DP5, it is acknowledged that a number of the concerns highlighted by consultees and neighbours concentrate on the design of the proposed dwelling. The design has been amended since the original submission following advice from our Conservation Officer and responding to a number of concerns raised by consultees and neighbours. One neighbour has now withdrawn their objection and supports the proposal following the submission of the amended plans leaving one objection from a neighbour. Although it is appreciated that the proposed dwelling will be larger in scale than the existing bungalow, the scale is considered appropriate given the high percentage of one and a half to two storey dwellings which exist in the immediate area. Originally the replacement was proposed to take the full width of the footprint of the bungalow to one and a half storeys high. The proposal was amended to reduce the width of the one and a half storey element which significantly breaks the massing of the building. A garage element has been removed, the proposed dormers have been re-designed to take on a more sympathetic form, and a front single storey element has been re-designed to be of a more traditional form, consistent to the more traditional character of the street and wider Conservation Area. An integrated panel of photovoltaics (PV) are proposed for the front elevation. The fact that the panel will be integrated, rather than

retro fitted, will improve the visual impact. Additionally, a number of properties along the road have PV panels installed under permitted development rights and their inclusion on the replacement dwelling is therefore considered acceptable. The brickwork, tile roof and powder coated joinery proposed is considered appropriate. However, it is considered that design detailing such as materials, hard and soft landscaping, joinery details, should be conditioned to ensure the details are appropriate. The proposal is therefore considered consistent with Policies DP4 and DP5 of the Development Management Policies DPD.

Amenity

- 5.5 Turning to impact on amenity, the dwelling to the immediate west is a single storey bungalow and the dwelling to the immediate east is a two storey dwelling house. The application was amended to reduce the massing of the proposed replacement dwelling, and consequent impact on amenity. The proposal was also amended to remove windows from the east elevation of the property, which faces the bungalow, to reduce overlooking. Obscure glazing is proposed for the west elevation, which faces the two storey dwelling house, which is considered appropriate subject to the details being submitted via condition. Whilst it is appreciated that the increase in scale of this dwelling will leave a single storey bungalow in between two x one and a half storey dwellings, given the orientation of the proposed replacement dwelling, which sits in-line with the two neighbouring dwellings (slightly behind the neighbour to the immediate east), and the spaces which exist in between the dwellings, it is not considered that the replacement dwelling will be overbearing or cause significant overshadowing. Taking into account the amendments which have been submitted it is not considered that there will be an adverse impact on amenity as a result of the proposals. It is therefore considered that the proposal accords with policy DP28 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2011). For clarification, whilst objections were received from two neighbouring properties, the neighbour in the bungalow (ie one of the closet properties) was not one of these; furthermore one of the neighbours who originally objected on amenity grounds has withdrawn their objection following the submission of the amended plans.

Trees

- 5.6 Large trees do exist on site and do contribute significantly to the wider character of the Conservation Area, it would therefore be preferable for them to be retained. The proposal does not include the removal of any trees, and trees close to the development are proposed to be protected through the course of development which is welcomed. Additional planting is proposed in the rear garden which is welcomed. There are currently concerns regarding the accuracy of the information provided, particularly regarding trees closest to the development site and additional information has been requested in this regard. Subject to the additional information being submitted and allaying concerns over accuracy, it is considered that there will be no adverse impact on trees as a result of the proposal, in accordance with Policy DP2 of the

Development Management Policies DPD (2011). Members will, however, be updated verbally on the proposed impact on trees.

Access

- 5.7 The same site access is proposed to be retained and given that, it is not considered that the use of the site will significantly increase as a result of the proposal and the retention is considered appropriate. It is therefore considered that there will be no adverse impact on highway safety as a result of the proposal. It is therefore considered that the proposal accords with policy DP11 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2011).

Ecology

- 5.8 An ecological report was submitted with the application which found that there was a small potential for disturbance of nesting birds if works are undertaken in the bird breeding/nesting season; it also recommended biodiversity enhancements. Therefore, subject to a condition covering timing of the works and enhancements to be agreed it is not considered there would be an adverse impact on ecology as a result of the proposal. The additional planting proposed in the rear garden has been designed with a strong emphasis for biodiversity gain which is welcomed. It is therefore considered that the proposal accords with policy DP1 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2011).

6 Conclusion

- 6.1 In conclusion the replacement dwelling is considered appropriate by virtue of its massing, location, design and is considered in character with immediate street scene and the wider character of the Conservation Area. It is not considered there will be an adverse impact on amenity, trees, access or ecology.

7 Recommendation

Approve subjection to conditions

1. Standard Time Limit
2. In accordance with amended plans and documents (including Arboricultural Survey) submitted
3. Hard and soft landscaping scheme to be submitted
4. Materials to be submitted
5. Details of obscure glazing to be submitted
6. Large scale joinery details to be submitted
7. Details of solar panels to be submitted
8. Bat boxes to be checked prior to development
9. Timing of works (outside of bird breeding/nesting season) unless checked prior
10. Biodiversity Enhancements to be agreed prior to commencement of development

Informative-
Bats and Light Pollution

8 Reason for Recommendation

- 8.1 In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the development accords with the NPPF and policies DP1, DP2, DP4, DP5, DP11, DP24 and DP28 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2011).

Background papers: BA/2018/0137/FUL

Author: Kayleigh Judson

Date of report: 5 July 2018

Appendices: Appendix 1 – Site location plan

